

REMARKS

After entry of the above amendments, claims 17-34 will be pending in the present application. Claims 1-16 have been cancelled. New claims 17-34 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the claims as originally filed and in the specification. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any cancelled claim in a continuation application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Previously pending claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,094,665 to Lyons et al. (hereinafter "Lyons").

Lyons is directed to "a way to test and correct URIs found within the digital-textual documents created by OCR systems or other systems that reproduce text less than 100 percent accurately" (col. 1, lns. 61-63).

Newly added claim 17 recites:

17. A method for retrieving a particular resource, the method comprising:

 parsing a resource descriptor associated with the particular resource, the resource descriptor comprising a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a signature, wherein the signature is not a uniform resource identifier;

 responsive to locating a candidate resource using the uniform resource identifier, confirming the candidate resource is the particular resource using the signature; and

 responsive to failing to locate the particular resource using the uniform resource identifier, locating the particular resource, a copy of the particular resource, or another resource similar to the particular resource using the signature.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lyons does not disclose, teach, or suggest the elements recited in claim 17. Lyons states:

Generally the invention provides a computerized method for correcting a uniform resource identifier (URI) in noisy text by detecting a URI within the noisy source document, attempting to find a first resource identified by the URI, and correcting the URI if the first resource is not found. After the URI is corrected, if may be converted into a hyperlink.

Correcting the URI may include detecting a possible syntax error within the URI, creating an alternate URI without the possible syntax error, and attempting to find a second resource that is identified by the alternate URI. In this way the alternate URI is tested for validity.

Similarly, the URI may be parsed and the individual portions of the URI can be incrementally tested and corrected. Thus a resource, identified by a first portion of the URI, can then be sought, and if not found, a possible syntax error within the first portion of the URI can be detected. When a possible syntax error is found, an alternate first portion is created and the resource it identifies is sought. If the resource identified by the alternate first portion is found, then the alternate first portion is used in place of the first portion in the URI. In this way, the URI is corrected portion by portion.

(Col. 2, Ins. 5-26).

Although Lyons discloses a URI and creating an alternate URI when the URI has a possible syntax error, it does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a resource descriptor . . . comprising a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a signature, wherein the signature is not a uniform resource identifier,” as recited in claim 17. In particular, the alternate URI cannot be construed as disclosing the “signature” recited in claim 17 because claim 17 explicitly recites that “the signature is not a uniform resource identifier.”

Further, Lyons is directed to what happens if a first resource identified by a URI is not found, it does not discuss what happens if the first resource identified by the URI is found. In contrast, claim 17 recites “responsive to locating a candidate resource using the uniform resource identifier, confirming the candidate resource is the particular resource using the signature.”

Hence, in claim 17, when a resource is located using the uniform resource identifier, an additional step is taken to confirm that the resource located is the resource sought to be retrieved.

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Lyons. Since claims 23 and 29 each recite elements similar to those of claim 17, it is respectfully submitted that those claims, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Lyon for at least the same reasons.

Newly added claim 18, which depends from claim 17, further recites "wherein failure to locate the particular resource using the uniform resource identifier is a result of relocation or deletion of the particular resource from a location identified by the uniform resource identifier." Lyons, as seen from the cited passage above, is directed to a situation where a first resource identified by a URI is not found due to a syntax error in the URI. It does not disclose, teach, or suggest a situation where a resource identified by a URI is not found because the resource has been moved or deleted.

Accordingly, based at least on the additional reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is further not anticipated by Lyons. Since claims 24 and 30 each recite elements similar to those of claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are further not anticipated by Lyons for at least the same reasons.

Newly added claim 19, which depends from claim 17, recites:

19. The method of claim 17, wherein the signature is a search query and wherein confirming the candidate resource is the particular resource comprises:

executing the search query to compile a result set; and

confirming the candidate resource is one of a predetermined number of top results in the result set.

Lyons does not disclose, teach, or suggest the elements recited in claim 19. Specifically, the term "query" cannot be found anywhere in Lyons. Therefore, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is further not anticipated by Lyons. Since claims 25 and 31 each recite elements similar to those of claim 19, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are further not anticipated by Lyons for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: November 9, 2006



Erin C. Ming
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 47,797
(650) 475-1449